

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

RICK GAWRONSKI,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 15-CV-300

CREDIT MANAGEMENT LIMITED PARTNERSHIP,

Defendant.

ORDER

Currently before the court is the motion of the plaintiff, Rick Gawronski, to compel discovery from defendant Credit Management Limited Partnership. (ECF No. 17.) On November 16, 2015, Credit Management filed a motion seeking an additional two weeks to respond to the motion to compel. (ECF No. 23.) The court denied the motion the same day, noting that Credit Management had failed to present good cause in support of its requested extension. (ECF No. 24.) The court ordered Credit Management to respond to the motion to compel “forthwith.” (ECF No. 24.)

“Forthwith” is a well-understood term in legal parlance meaning “immediately; without delay.” *Black’s Law Dictionary* 769 (10th ed. 2014). It has been more than a week and Credit Management has taken no action.

Credit Management's "[f]ailure to file a memorandum in opposition to a motion is sufficient cause for the Court to grant the motion. The Court also may impose sanctions under General L. R. 83(f)." Civ. L.R. 7(d).

In light of Credit Management's failure to respond to Gawronski's motion to compel, the motion to compel is **granted** in its entirety. Credit Management shall comply with Gawronski's discovery demands within **14 days** of the date of this order.

Finally, if the parties are unable to come to an agreement as to Gawronski's reasonable expenses incurred in pursuing its motion to compel, Gawronski may, within **21 days** of this order, file a motion for reasonable expenses and attorney's fees. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(5)(A).

SO ORDERED.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 24th day of November, 2015.


WILLIAM E. DUFFIN
U.S. Magistrate Judge